



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,933	10/26/2001	Timothy R. Bratton	21685-06158	8588

60380 7590 01/25/2008
STEVEN C. STEWART
REALNETWORKS, INC.
2601 ELLIOTT AVENUE, SUITE 1000
SEATTLE, WA 98121

EXAMINER

SHERR, CRISTINA O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/046,933

Applicant(s)

BRATTON ET AL.

Examiner

CRISTINA OWEN SHERR

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/05/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-36 and 38-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-36 and 38-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to applicants' amendment filed November 5, 2007. Claims 1-12, 14-36 and 38-60 are currently pending in this case.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, 14-36 and 38-60 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mages et al (6185306) in view of Hazra (US 6,510,553).

5. Regarding claim 1

Mages et al (See 306 Figs. 3-3, and 12, Col. 4, lines 1-65, Col. 8. lines 30-50, Col. 10, lines 1-30 and claims 1-8) disclose a method for playing media files from two portions, each of which is unusable as a media file and each of which is delivered via a separate channel substantially as claimed.

6. Hazra discloses, which Mages does not, having a plurality of second file portions (e.g. col 4 ln 18-40), wherein each may be received without reference to the content of the others (e.g. col 8 ln 54 – col 9 ln 15).

Art Unit: 3621

7. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mages and Hazra motivated by the desire for a faster transmission, thus avoiding "choppy" playing of media.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mages et al (6185306) in view of Hazra (US 6,510,553) further in view of Secord et al (6,373,831).

10. Mages and Hazra disclose as discussed above.

11. Regarding the wireless limitations of claim 2, Secord et al (See Figs. 2-5) show portable wireless computing devices that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations and it would be obvious to disconnect the receiver once reception is complete since wireless charges are based on per minute rates.

12. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Mages et al because employing portable computing devices are equivalent to the claim limitations in order to practice the disclosure of the prior art.

13. Regarding limitations of claims 3 and 4 -

Art Unit: 3621

Mages et al (See 306 Figs. 3-3, and 12, Col. 4, lines 1-65, Col. 8. lines 3050, Col. 10, lines 1-30 and claims 1-8) disclose playing media files from two portions, each of which is unusable as a media file and each of which is delivered via a separate channel that is the equivalent of the claim limitations.

14. Regarding the component limitations of claim 5

Conventional computer components include docking stations that are the equivalents of the claim limitations.

15. Regarding transmission limitations of claim 6

Mages et al (See 306 Figs. 3-3, and 12, Col. 4, lines 1-65, Col. 8. lines 30-50, Col. 10, lines 1-30 and claims 1-8) disclose playing media files from two portions, each of which is unusable as a media file and each of which is delivered via a separate channel that is the equivalent of the claim limitations.

16. Regarding description limitations of claim 7

Mages et al (See 306 Figs. 3-3, and 12, Col. 4, lines 1-65, Col. 8. lines 30-50, Col. 10, lines 1-30 and claims 1-8) disclose playing media files from two portions, each of which is unusable as a media file and each of which is delivered via a separate channel that is the equivalent of the claim limitations.

17. Regarding key limitations of claim 8

Mages et al (See 306 Figs. 3-3, and 12, Col. 4, lines 1-65, Col. 8. lines 30-50, Col. 10, lines 1-30 and claims 1-8) disclose playing media files from two portions, each of which is unusable as a media file and each of which is delivered via a separate channel that is the equivalent of the claim limitations because uncripling is based on employing a key.

Art Unit: 3621

18. Claims 9-12, 14-36, and 38-60 are rejected under the same criteria as above.

19. Examiner's Note: Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cristina Owen Sherr whose telephone number is 571-272-6711. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday through Friday.

21. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Fischer can be reached on 571-272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

22. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 3621

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Cristina Owen Sherr
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3621



ANDREW J. FISCHER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600